DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 261 725 JC 850 511

AUTHOR Simmons, Jo An McGuire
TITLE Testing the Effectiveness of the One-To-One Method of Teaching Composition: Improvement of Learning in English Project.
INSTITUTION Los Angeles Community Coll. District, Calif. Educational Services Div.
PUB DATE Apr 79
NOTE 39p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Colleges; Educational Assessment; *English Instruction; *Individualized Instruction; *Program Evaluation; Remedial Instruction; Two Year Colleges; *Writing (Composition); Writing Skills
IDENTIFIERS *Garrison Method

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted in the Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) to test the effectiveness of the Garrison method, a one-to-one method of teaching composition, as a means of improving learning in composition classes with students inexperienced in writing and lacking in language skills. A comparison was made between experimental and control groups on four campuses with respect to student scores on essay and objective tests and questionnaire responses from students and teachers. Study findings included the following: (1) Garrison method students showed significantly greater writing gains on pre- and post-test essay exams than control group students; (2) remedial classes gained significantly more than freshman English classes on essay exams; (3) there were no significant differences among the four colleges involved on essay exam results; (4) an analysis of student gains showed that teaching method alone made no significant difference to progress in vocabulary, usage, and sentence structure as measured by objective test results; (5) 78.4% of the Garrison method students had better feelings about themselves as writers after the class; (6) Garrison classes generally retained a higher percentage of students than control group classes; and (7) teacher morale in Garrison classes was high. Based on study findings it was recommended that the LACCD provide training in the Garrison method; provide funding for in-class tutors; publish report findings; develop an employment classification for in-class tutors; fund an essay placement exam; and limit enrollment in composition classes to 35 students. (LAL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ED261725

LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
617 West Seventh Street, Los Angeles, California 90017 (213) 628-7788
City • East • Harbor • Metropolitan • Mission • Pierce • Southwest • Trade-Technical • Valley • West
Divison of
EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

TESTING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE ONE-TO-ONE METHOD OF TEACHING COMPOSITION:

IMPROVEMENT OF LEARNING IN ENGLISH PROJECT

April 1979

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
L. Koltai
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Office of Educational Programs

IC 850 511

REPORT ON THE EXPERIMENT TESTING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE ONE-TO-ONE METHOD OF TEACHING COMPOSITION

IMPROVEMENT OF LEARNING IN ENGLISH PROJECT

LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

Jo An McGuire Simmons
Project Director
Los Angeles City College

April 1979

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

THE METHOD 1

THE EXPERIMENT 3

ESSAY EXAMS 5

Table 1 7

Table 2 8

Table 3 8

Table 4 9

OBJECTIVE TESTS 11

QUESTIONNAIRES 12

Table 5 14

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE DISTRICT 16

APPENDIXES

A. Behavioral Goals for English I Classes 18

Behavioral Goals for English 60's Series or English 28 Classes 19

B. Essay 20

C. Holistic/Agreement/Scoring Session 21

D. Analysis of Variances of Gains 23

E. Summary of Student Questionnaire 25

F. Summary of Teacher Questionnaire 28

FOREWORD

In 1976 Chancellor Leslie Koltai established, with the approval of the Board of Trustees, a special fund for improvement of instruction in English. This action was a follow-up to a District-wide conference for teachers of reading and writing, which focused on the problem of improving writing skills of the students in the Los Angeles Community Colleges.

The Garrison one-to-one tutorial method was selected by the English department chairpersons from a number of proposals sumbitted for their consideration. The chairpersons also selected JoAn McGuire Simmons of LACC to be the project director. Under her leadership a project team was formed of faculty, experts in the "Garrison Method", and experts in research. The project took the form of an experiment to determine if the "Garrison Method" would be effective in the Los Angeles Community Colleges.

The outcome of the experiment gives evidence that the method is effective. The faculty who elect to use the method can do so with the confidence that the method had been tested, and has shown significant results in terms of improvement in student learning.

JoAn McGuire Simmons and the faculty who participated with her in the project deserve special mention for a difficult job well done. The results of their efforts will encourage future innovation, and will be used in staff development activities for faculty who decide to use the tutorial method in the teaching of writing.

John T. McCuen
Vice Chancellor
Educational Services

Louis F. Hilleary
Director
Educational Programs

INTRODUCTION

In 1975 a tentative, untested answer was given to the question, "How can we improve learning in our composition classes with students so inexperienced in writing and language skills?" The setting was A Conference for Teachers of Reading and Writing of the Los Angeles Community College District, sponsored by Chancellor Leslie Koltai who set up an Improvement of Learning in English Fund to enable English faculties to follow through on the research presented. The hypothetical answer was teaching composition one-to-one, the Garrison method, already in use at Santa Barbara City College and on various campuses around the country. Thus, a pilot program testing the effectiveness of the Garrison method began in 1977, progressing through an instruction phase in which Los Angeles Community College District English teachers attended workshops led by Roger Garrison and by Lorraine Hatch and Douglas Fossek of Santa Barbara City College on instruction in the method; an implementation phase in which instructors on four campuses--Los Angeles City College, East Los Angeles College, Valley College, and Los Angeles Trade Tech--used the method under the supervision of the project director; and an evaluation phase in which "Garrison" classes were matched with non-Garrison classes and tested with pretest and post test essays to evaluate the method. We now have a tested, proven answer. On all four campuses, students in the individualized Garrison classes made greater gains in writing ability than the students in the control sections. This was true on both the remedial level and the Freshman English level. Details of the method, the experiment and the findings, and recommendations follow.

THE METHOD

The individualized method is as old as Oxford University's tutorials and as new as Roger Garrison's article "One-to-One Tutorial Instruction

in Freshman Composition" in the Spring 1974 issue of New Directions for Community Colleges. Like Santa Barbara City College, the Los Angeles Community College District has modified Garrison's method for use in community colleges by using several tutors in the classroom with the teacher. The heart of the method is the student-teacher conference which enables the instructor to teach with the greatest impact--one-to-one, giving individualized, step-by-step guidance. Instead of receiving a corrected theme, red-penciled with symbols indicating errors which he may or may not know how to correct, the student receives personal direction from the teacher who tries to find at least one good thing to say about the writing, points out the problems and gives suggestions for the next draft. A theme usually goes through several drafts before it is accepted. One objective at a time is looked at in the theme conference and the student knows what the teacher is looking for in each conference. The writing process is broken down into a sequence of skills incorporated into these objectives:[1]

1. Having enough concrete, specific information.
2. Having a central idea, or in English I, a thesis.
3. Having an organizational plan.
4. Having sentences which are sound in grammar, dynamic in form and accurate in punctuation.
5. Having word choices which are effective and spelled correctly.

The student must satisfy the requirement of each conference objective before he can proceed to the next objective. The teacher knows the student's writing needs and can zero in on a particular problem the student is having and prescribe a specific solution. The trained teacher can conduct twelve such theme conferences a period, while the other students are writing or checking with the trained tutors. Other important features of the method are these:

1. The bulk of the student's time is spent on the skill itself--on writing--not on group discussions about writing or on group drills or exercises which may or may not be pertinent to the

---

[1]Professor Douglas Fossek of Santa Barbara City College contributed to the wording of these objectives. A more detailed list of behavioral objectives is found in the Appendix A.

individual student or carry over into his writing. The Garrison classes were not excused from meeting other class requirements as described in each campus catalog. Typically these classes meet for a general session one hour a week and as a one-to-one tutorial workshop for the other two hours. During the general session English I classes discuss the assigned readings, develop critical reading skills, learn the units on logic, semantics, and library research techniques, and the remedial classes hold general lessons on the principle of grammar or usage being studied and on reading assignments. Two-thirds of the time is spent on writing and rewriting.

2. The student is not discouraged by being penalized for lacking skills at the beginning of the semester. Only after a groundwork of skills has been laid down is the student graded on his performance. The student receives encouragement from the teacher who responds directly to what he has written.
3. The teacher-student relationship is more pleasant to both. Condemnation of initial lack of skills is made unnecessary by the grading system and, although the teacher must inevitably be the grader/judge of the student's skills, during most of the semester he can act as helper/editor.

THE EXPERIMENT

To evaluate the effectiveness of this method, the following hypotheses were developed:

1. After a semester's instruction using the Garrison method, students would show greater gains in writing skill than students instructed in other methods as measured below.
2. The morale of students and teachers using this method would be high: the students would have positive feelings about their

writing and the class, and the teachers would find satisfaction in teaching the method and class as measured by questionnaires.[2]

To test the first hypothesis, eight control groups meeting at the same hour as the "Garrison" groups were randomly chosen on both the remedial and Freshman English level, giving us four sections on each of the four campuses. Both experimental and control groups were to be limited to an enrollment of thirty students, but this was not enforced on two campuses.

Teachers on the four campuses were selected by their department chairperson. Most of the Garrison teachers were volunteers from the group of forty-six who were interested in the Garrison method and who had attended the District-sponsored Roger Garrison Workshop. One such teacher was requested by his chairperson to be in the project. The control group teachers were not chosen per se, but rather control classes were chosen meeting at the same hour as the Garrison classes. In a confidential memo on teacher selection, the four chairpersons reported that the control teachers were chosen according to hour; where there was a choice of several teachers, the chairperson selected a teacher receptive and open to the idea of the project or a volunteer. Both Garrison and control teachers received extra pay for participating in the project. One teacher from each group decided to leave the project and was replaced. It has been suggested that perhaps the Garrison teachers as a group were inherently superior to the control teachers (as evidenced by their readiness to use an innovative method). In the same confidential memo, the chairpersons rated their Garrison and control teachers on a scale of one (not effective) to five (extremely effective). The combined rating for the Garrison teachers was 3.50; the combined rating for the control teachers was 4.20.

---

[2]The state of student morale in regular composition classes--students' dread of taking English I, their putting off taking composition classes until the last semester possible, their attrition--was felt to be known, as was the state of morale of teachers facing today's students with fewer skills and less preparation, resulting in less visible progress from teaching efforts.

ESSAY EXAMS

The main instrument for measuring writing gains was an essay given to all students in both February and May. Dr. Edward White, Coordinator of English Testing Programs and Director of the English Equivalency Examination program for the California State University and Colleges, helped in the selection of the essay question (See Appendix B for question) which had been pretested on students at San Bernardino Valley College. At his suggestion, three College Board Descriptive Tests of Language Skills--Vocabulary, Usage, and Sentence Structure--were also administered in February and in May. Dr. White cautioned not to expect measurable gains, as his experience as a consultant in similar projects and his acquaintance with the literature led him not to expect gains in such a complex skill as writing in such a short period of time.

The method used to evaluate the essays was holistic scoring. On June 2, 1978, the pretest and post test essays were mixed together and blind-graded by a group of Los Angeles Community College District teachers specially trained by Dr. White, who had no other connection with the project. Codes and social security numbers, rather than names or other identification were used on the blue book essays. Previous to the holistic scoring day, Room Leader Professor Judith Hert and Table Leaders, California State University Professors Eileen Lothamer, John White and Larry Kramer had read and ranked a sample of 300 essays and developed a Criteria Guide for ranking the essays on a scale from 1 to 12. (See Appendix C for the Criteria Guide.) The holistic grading session was supervised by Dr. Edward White and the reliability of the Los Angeles Community College District readers, as measured by the number of essays requiring three readings, was in the range acceptable and usual for California State University holistic readings.

Each student's pretest and post test essays scores were then given to Dr. Robert Alworth, Chief Research Analyst for the District Office of Educational Information for analysis. He ran an analysis of variance of gains in scores with the criterion broken down by method, level, and college. (See Appendix D.)

Here are his findings:

1. The Garrison method students showed significantly greater gains between pretest and post test than did non-Garrison students. The average Garrison student gained 0.968, while the average non-Garrison student lost 0.218. This difference existed across colleges and across levels. (Remedial vs. Freshman English.)
2. Remedial classes gained significantly more than Freshman English classes between pretest and post test. The average remedial student gained 0.623 between pretest and post test, while the average freshman student gained only 0.177. This difference existed across colleges and methods. (Garrison vs. non-Garrison.)
3. There was no significant difference between colleges in gain scores.

Not only did Garrison classes show greater gains than non-Garrison classes, but Garrison classes showed greater achievement with six out of eight classes improving their ranking and the seventh class maintaining its rank of number one. Only one control class improved its ranking, while six lowered theirs and one remained the same as can be seen from the chart of pretest essay averages and post test essay averages. The most outstanding change in rank was the remedial class taught by Garrison teacher Genevieve Meyer at Trade Tech which started at the bottom, Rank 16 and moved to Rank 8 on the post test rankings.

Table 1

All Pretest Averages

Rank	Code	Average	Type of Class	Campus	Method (Garrison or Non-Garrison)
1	321	9.09	English I	Valley	Garrison
2	322	8.36	English I	Valley	non-Garrison
3	222	7.85	English I	East Los Angeles	non-Garrison
4	121	7.55	English I	City College	Garrison
5	311	7.50	Remedial	Valley	Garrison
6	312	6.80	Remedial	Valley	non-Garrison
7	221	6.73	English I	East Los Angeles	Garrison
8	422	6.50	English I	Trade Tech	non-Garrison
9	421	6.26	English I	Trade Tech	Garrison
10	212	6.11	Remedial	East Los Angeles	non-Garrison
11	412	5.71	Remedial	Trade Tech	non-Garrison
12	122	5.68	English I	City College	non-Garrison
13	211	5.44	Remedial	East Los Angeles	Garrison
14	112	5.42	Remedial	City College	non-Garrison
15	111	5.17	Remedial	City College	Garrison
16	411	5.13	Remedial	Trade Tech	Garrison

All Post Test Averages

1	321	9.54	English I	Valley	Garrison
2	121	8.94	English I	City College	Garrison
3	311	8.58	Remedial	Valley	Garrison
4	221	8.40	English I	East Los Angeles	Garrison
5	322	7.86	English I	Valley	non-Garrison
6	312	7.80	Remedial	Valley	non-Garrison
7	222	7.57	English I	East Los Angeles	non-Garrison
8	411	6.56	Remedial	Trade Tech	Garrison
9	211	6.25	Remedial	East Los Angeles	Garrison
10	112	6.21	Remedial	City College	non-Garrison
11	421	6.15	English I	Trade Tech	Garrison
12	422	6.14	English I	Trade Tech	non-Garrison
13	111	6.00	Remedial	City College	Garrison
14	212	5.55	Remedial	East Los Angeles	non-Garrison
15	412	5.47	Remedial	Trade Tech	non-Garrison
16	122	4.75	English I	City College	non-Garrison

The difference in the Garrison students' achievement can be seen in Table 2 below:

Table 2 — All Remedial Classes

	Garrison Classes	Non-Garrison Classes	Difference
Pretest average	23.24	24.04	.80
Post test average	27.39	25.03	-2.36
Difference	4.15	.99	

All Freshman English Classes

	Garrison Classes	Non-Garrison Classes	Difference
Pretest average	29.63	28.39	1.24
Post test average	33.03	26.32	-6.71
Difference	3.40	-2.07	

All Classes

	Garrison Classes	Non-Garrison Classes	Difference
Pretest average	52.87	52.43	.44
Post test average	60.42	51.35	-9.07
Difference	7.55	-1.08	

Achievement of individual classes, coded G for Garrison and N for non-Garrison is shown in Table 3. Notice that individual non-Garrison classes, especially remedial classes, made gains and that one Garrison class made a loss, though it lost less than its control class. The results from this control class are questionable, as one-third of the students remaining in the class did not write a post test essay.

Table 3 — Individual Remedial Classes

	L.A. City College		East Los Angeles		Valley College		Trade Tech	
	111G	112N	211G	212N	311G	312N	411G	412N
Pre	5.17	5.42	5.44	6.11	7.50	6.80	5.13	5.71
Post	6.00	6.21	6.25	5.55	8.58	7.80	6.56	5.47
Diff.	+.83	+.79	+.81	-.56	+1.08	+1.00	+1.43	-.24

Individual Freshman English Classes

	121G	122N	221G	222N	321G	322N	421G	422N
Pre	7.55	5.68	6.73	7.85	9.09	8.36	6.26	6.50
Post	8.94	4.75	8.40	7.57	9.54	7.86	6.15	6.14
Diff.	+1.39	-.93	+1.67	-.28	+.45	-.50	-.11	-.36

The final table prepared by Dr. Ben Gold, Research Director, Los Angeles City College, shows the significance of mean Differences.

Table 4 Chart of t Test for Significance of Mean Differences

CODE	N	X_1	S_1	X_2	S_2	r	X_2-X_1	t
111	16	5.17	1.38	6.00	1.97	.19	.83	1.38
121	17	7.55	2.37	8.94	2.34	.71	1.39	1.72
112	14	5.42	1.94	6.21	2.22	.77	.79	1.00
122	16	5.68	2.02	4.75	1.80	.37	- .93	-1.37
211	14	5.44	2.25	6.25	2.35	.20	.81	0.93
212	17	6.11	1.62	5.55	2.21	.69	- .56	-0.84
221	17	6.73	2.71	8.40	1.94	.40	1.67	2.07*
222	14	7.85	2.14	7.57	2.24	.48	- .28	-0.34
311	12	7.50	2.39	8.58	1.24	.56	1.08	1.39
312	10	6.80	2.61	7.80	2.29	.54	1.00	0.91
321	11	9.09	1.51	9.54	1.63	.46	.45	0.67
322	14	8.36	2.22	7.86	1.83	.34	.50	-0.65
411	23	5.13	1.98	6.56	1.97	.37	1.43	2.54*
412	25	5.71	2.22	5.47	1.87	.77	- .24	-0.41
421	15	6.26	2.49	6.15	2.16	.77	- .11	0.13
422	15	6.50	3.23	6.14	2.28	.70	- .36	-0.35

* Significant at 5% level

Before going on to the other two instruments for testing the hypotheses, some interpretation of the foregoing data seems in order:

1. How is it that many students wrote a higher-scoring pretest essay than post test essay?

   The fact that a loss occurred is not uncommon in changing or improving a skill. To use the analogy of tennis, when a player abandons his old serve and before he has acquired skill in and control of his new serve, there is a period in which his serve is worse than before. The students wrote their February pretests with some confidence. During the semester, they became aware of their writing faults and their substandard language patterns, but many did not have enough practice to acquire new patterns by the May post test.

   The Garrison students' gain can be accounted for by the fact that these students spent two-thirds of their classtime in writing and directed rewriting and that the method systematically builds skills by its requirements of competency in one objective before going on to the next. There was enough practice to lay down a new pattern of writing.

2. How is it that some remedial classes scored higher than English I classes? Isn't there a clear demarcation between these two levels?

   The four campuses draw from four very different populations. The fact that Valley College's remedial classes outranked four English I classes on other campuses stems from Valley's drawing from a more affluent, suburban population with better preparation than the other campuses.

   Even so, one may ask, shouldn't the standards for English I, a university transfer class, be the same on all campuses? Indeed, they should. The ideal way of placing students in the right level class is to give them an essay placement exam. The difficulty in doing this has been the lack of funding to have these essays holistically read, the lack of cooperation by administrations on various campuses who favor registration by mail which rules out a placement test, and the difficulty of getting students on campus to take a placement test before

classes begin. Thus, there has been no uniform placement process, various campuses using various objective tests. The English Council of English Department Chairpersons is studying this problem and will make recommendations to the District this spring. Finally, the Garrison method enabled some remedial students to write essays rated higher than those written by some English I students.

3. Why did the remedial students gain more than the English I students?

   The greater gain can be accounted for partly by the greater room for improvement that the remedial students had. It would also seem that the course requirements for English I are so diffuse--critical reading, logic, semantics, library research, in addition to composition--that students, especially those weak in preparation, do not have enough concentrated practice in writing. The greatest losses were made by non-Garrison English I students. However, three out of four Garrison classes, having the same diffuse requirements, showed gains, with Hannah Ackerman's East Los Angeles College English I class, making the greatest individual gain of any class.

4. What does the lack of significant differences between campuses in gain scores mean?

   It means that the Garrison method works as well on campuses with lower-income, high-minority populations as on the campus with the higher-income, low-minority population.

OBJECTIVE TESTS

The second instrument used in testing was the three College Board Descriptive Test of Language Skills--Vocabulary, Usage, and Sentence Structure. These three tests were administered in both February and May. An analysis of gain showed that "Method alone (Garrison vs. non-Garrison) made no significant difference to progress in any of the measures--vocabulary, usage, and sentence structure." As these tests did not directly measure writing gain, they were not our main concern. The copious data are not included here, but several tables of mean gain

scores and an analysis of variance table for each of the three tests are available from the Project Director Jo An Simmons at Los Angeles City College.

QUESTIONNAIRES

The third instrument, the student and teacher questionnaires, tested the hypothesis that student and teacher morale would be high in Garrison classes and that students would have a positive feeling about their writing and the class and that teachers would find greater satisfaction in teaching the class. The Summary of Student Questionnaire is found in Appendix E. Here are some highlights from the summary. In response to the question, "Since you have been in this class, do you have a better feeling about yourself as a writer than you had before?" one hundred and thirteen students (78.4%) answered "yes," six students (4.1%) answered "no," and twenty-five students (17%) answered "not sure." In response to the question, "Would you recommend more classes like this?" one hundred and seventeen students (82.9%) answered "yes," four (2.8%) answered "no," and twenty students (14.1%) answered "not sure." The students ranked the helpfulness of components of the class as follows:

1. The chance to rewrite and revise papers.
2. The teacher.
3. Receiving a personal explanation, rather than written comments on papers.
4. Learning to check own writing.
5. Working on one thing at a time in writing skills.
6. Individual theme conferences.
7. The smaller number of students enrolled.
8. The tutors.

The students responded to the fill-in questions as follows. In answer to the question "What did you like about this class?" all English I sections liked the personal attention, individual help and personal explanations. All sections mentioned the chance to rewrite and revise, to write a "perfect" paper, and to improve papers and grades. What many students liked most was their growth in skills, e.g. in organization, in putting a sentence together. The chance to express themselves and to choose their own topics was also mentioned. The "relaxed" atomosphere,

the absence of stress, and working at their own pace were named and several students found their English I class easier than they had expected. The smaller number of students in class was mentioned frequently. Several students liked "everything."

The remedial students liked the same things as the English I students but really valued the new relationship they had with the teacher in personal conferences. Many mentioned encouragement and gain-in-confidence as what they liked best. One student wrote, "I liked the way the teacher talked to each student on how they were doing and what we needed to improve and how he brought out the best in each student."

In answer to the question, "What did you dislike about this class?" some English I students disliked the term paper requirement, the number of themes required and the turn-over in tutors; some wanted more tutoring. Thirty-two English I students found nothing to dislike.

Some remedial students disliked the discrepancy between what the teacher said and what the tutor said; some wanted more instruction in grammar and fewer students in class; and one section wanted deadlines for their themes. Twenty-five remedial students found nothing to dislike.

In answer to the question, "What more could the teacher have done to help you?" some English I students wanted more detailed explanations and sample papers, more conferences, more tutors, and one wanted a "few more jokes." Forty-four English I students thought the teacher had done everything possible to help; as one put it, "She done it all."

Some remedial students wanted more detailed explanations, several wanted more grammar instruction and thirty-seven students thought the teacher had done everything possible to help.

In answer to the question, "What more could the tutors have done?" English I and remedial students both wanted the tutors to know exactly what type of paper the teacher wanted. They wanted the tutors to be encouraging and to give clear explanations. Ninety-four students thought the tutors had done everything possible to help them.

Finally, the number of students remaining in a class at the end of the semester gives some measure of student morale. As can be seen from Table 5, in twelve out of sixteen sections, Garrison classes retained a higher percentage of students than non-Garrison, with two sections being

tied and one non-Garrison class retaining a higher percentage of students than its Garrison counterpart.

Table 5 Percentage of Students Retained

Campus	Class	Number of Students at Second Census	Number Remaining in Testing Program	% Retained
LACC	Garrison Remedial	27	17	63%
	non-Garrison Remedial	29	14	48%
	Garrison English I	32	21	66%
	non-Garrison English I	29	16	55%
East LA	Garrison Remedial	32	16	50%
	non-Garrison Remedial	41	17	41%
	Garrison English I	24	17	71%
	non-Garrison English I	20	14	70%
Trade Tech	Garrison Remedial	37	23	62%
	non-Garrison Remedial	36	21	58%
	Garrison English I	27	19	70%
	non-Garrison English I	30	21	70%
Valley	Garrison Remedial	18	13	72%
	non-Garrison Remedial	20	14	70%
	Garrison English I	17	11	65%
	non-Garrison English I	19	14	68%

Teacher morale was also high as can be seen from the Summary of Teacher Questionnaires, Appendix F. In comparing the satisfaction in teaching the Garrison method to the satisfaction the teachers had in teaching the conventional method, eight teachers (100%) found the Garrison method more satisfying. In response to the question, "Do you have a better feeling about yourself as a composition teacher now than before you learned the Garrison method?" all eight answered "yes." Asked if they felt better about themselves as composition teachers than before, six said, "yes," none said "no," and one was "not sure." In answer to the key question, "Given tutors to help you, would you use this method next semester?" all answered, "yes."

The teachers ranked items of teacher satisfaction as follows, with a three-way tie for first place.

1. Knowing a student's writing needs more specifically.
   Having some input--a chance to intervene--while the theme is still in progress.
   Having the pressure on the students to produce, rather than on the teacher to "give" grades.
4. Having a slightly different role in relationship to the student (more helper-assessor than grader-judge).
5. Seeing individual progress made by the student.
6. Having more "assessment" and less "grading" to do.
7. Being free from grading each piece of writing.
8. Having fewer papers to take home.

Like the students, the teachers ranked the helpfulness of components of the class, although they had a slightly different list of components:

1. Giving individualized instruction.
2. The opportunity for students to rewrite and revise.
3. Individual theme conferences.
4. Giving personal explanations, rather than written comments.
5. Smaller number of students enrolled.
6. Working on one thing at a time in writing skills.
7. Students learning to check own writing.
8. Tutors.
9. Students knowing the grading standards.

In a fill-in space asking for additional comments on the effectiveness of the Garrison method in achieving composition goals, the teachers mentioned improved student attitude--"Students really care about what they otherwise consider petty considerations of syntax, structure, spelling. The care when they know a teacher is going to sit down and discuss the paper"; greater feedback to the students--"Live feedback is important. Students can ask questions they don't understand"; and help from tutors--"Many of the Garrison methods are pedagogically superior. But my greatest asset in the classroom was a tutor with a bachelor's degree and experience teaching elementary students."

In the other fill-in question, the teachers wrote about modifications they would make to the method, their difficulties and joys in using the

method, and working with tutors. (Some editing of these comments was necessary due to their length.) Modifications to the method included more themes written under pressure in a class period without help from a tutor. As one teacher stated, "The major flaw is the ability of the student to pass the course having handed in work which to varying degrees may not be his own i.e. revised and aided by tutors and teachers." Another teacher said, "I began by using 'pure' Garrison but feel now that I want to 'blend' the traditional structure with Garrison--grades, specific modes of writing, deadlines, lectures on basics of grammar, spelling and punctuation." One wrote of the difficulty of the first few "nerve-wracking" weeks and several of the joys--"I had students who I thought made significant progress, and I have seldom felt that way before." The necessity for a smaller number of students and for tutors was stressed. The newness of working with tutors--"knowing how to supervise tutors is a problem--how to know what the tutors are advising--how to intervene when they goof" and their value--"Tutors were a real help; they had fresh ideas and enthusiasm...I fervently hope that ultimately all composition teachers who want tutors in the class can have them" were discussed.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE DISTRICT

1. Encourage composition teachers to learn this method by providing training through District-wide workshops, campus workshops and attendance of one person from each campus at Roger Garrison's two-week Maine workshop.
2. Provide funding for in-class tutors so that the method can be used on all interested campuses.
3. Recommend that the research and findings of this report be written in an article for a national English teachers publication such as College English or College Composition and Communication.

4. Develop an employment classification for in-class tutors that would accommodate the various kinds of people that are available to the various campuses. (Some campuses close to universities used university students, others used local students, and others used people from California Department of Employment.) Hourly pay should be high enough to attract good people.
5. Fund an essay placement exam to be graded holistically on each campus.
6. Limit enrollment in composition classes to thirty-five, assuming that attrition will bring the number down to a manageable size.

On behalf of all the English teachers in the District, I would like to thank the Board of Trustees, Chancellor Leslie Koltai and Vice Chancellor John Mc Cuen for making this project possible and for their support of quality instruction in English.

I would personally like to thank Dr. Ben Gold, Dr. Louis Hilleary, Coordinator David Moody, Dr. Sue Verity and Dr. Edward White for their help in this project, all the project teachers--Hannah Ackerman, Dr. Marianne Boretz, Ray Butman, Safford Chamberlain, Tom Clayton, Dr. Boyd Collins, Toni Forsyth-Smith, Lee Hancock, Dick Harmetz, Earle Jager, Dr. Frank La Ferriere, Edythe McGovern, Thomas Mc Guire, Genevieve Meyer, Don Rademacher, and Harrison West--and their chairpersons, Mel Brown, Rose Najar, Jim Simmons and Steve Statham. I would especially like to thank my husband, Chairman Jim Simmons, whose idea sparked the project.

APPENDIX A

Behavioral Goals for English I Classes

By the end of one semester, the student will be able to produce a five-paragraph expository theme (450-500 words) meeting the following criteria:

1. Having enough specific, concrete information in themes.

   To meet this criterion, the student should make prewriting lists of specifics--details, examples, image words about the subject, reasons and reactions written in free association style. Included in this criterion is having enough to say and telling the whole idea.

2. Having a central idea (thesis) and a controlling viewpoint which shapes the specifics.

   Lead sentences make statements about the specifics. In a long theme, this will be the thesis sentence; in a paragraph, it will be the topic sentence.

   Lead sentences evolve from asking these questions: What do the facts say? Do these facts add up to anything? What do I want to say about these facts? Are there several generalizations that will cover or explain these facts?

   A controlling viewpoint keeps all of the specifics consistent with the purpose and keeps the tone consistent with the audience.

3. Having an organizational plan which shapes the parts--a clear beginning, middle, and end.

   A good thesis sentence will organize the theme. Deft use of transitions, parallelism and pattern gives themes direction.

4. Having sentences which are precise vehicles of thought, are grammatically sound, and are correctly punctuated.

5. Having word choices which are effective and spelled correctly.

Behavioral Goals for English 60's Series
or
English 28 Classes

By the end of one semester, the student will be able to produce an essay of at least three paragraphs, exhibiting the following characteristics:

1. In the essay, the student will be able to express a central idea which is supported with concrete detail.

2. The student will be able to develop an essay in which an organizational plan is apparent, which has a clear beginning, middle, and end.

3. The student will eliminate these problems in sentence structure and mechanics which characterize his writing at the beginning of the semester:

    a. Run-on sentences and comma splices.

    b. Fragments.

    c. Missing word endings--s's and ed's.

    d. Incorrect tense.

    e. Faulty agreement of subject and verb.

    f. Use of wrong word--accept/except; their/there/they're, etc.

    g. Errors in usage.

    h. Misspellings.

Regular themes which can be revised should be free of the grammatical problems already studied. The last three themes should have a minimum of errors. The final exam which is written under pressure may contain a few errors, but most sentences should meet standard English requirements.

APPENDIX B

Code No. _____

Class Section No. _____

Social Security No. _____

DIRECTIONS:

Write an essay answering the question below. You are to use a pen, and if you have brought a dictionary, you may use that also. Do note that although the question is personal, your name does not appear on the exam, so your privacy is protected. There is no word requirement; simply follow the directions and answer the question.

Write your code number, class section number, and your social security number at the top of this page.

DO NOT WRITE YOUR NAME ON THIS SHEET OR ON YOUR ESSAY.

QUESTION:

We have all been involved in work of one kind or another which has proved valuable for our growth as persons. Some jobs are unpaid, like sewing your own clothes, or cleaning out the garage. The job may have been boring or satisfying, but it had some impact on our thinking about what we wanted out of life, or how we were going to plan our futures. Job experience can affect the decisions we make about our lives. For example, church sponsored activities may instill a desire to become a social worker, an assembly line job may produce in us a desire for a more fulfilling type of employment, or a job as a clerk may instill in us a desire to become a manager of a grocery store.

Describe such a job in detail and explain how it affected your attitudes toward yourself and your future.

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

Reader #1	_____	_____
Reader #2	_____	_____
Discrepancy Reader	_____	_____
Final Score		_____

APPENDIX C

Holistic Agreement/Scoring Session
June 2-3, 1978

DIRECTIONS:

Write an essay answering the question below. You are tc use a pen, and if you have brought a dictionary, you may use that also. Do note that although the question is personal, your name does not appear on the exam, so your privacy is protected. There is no word requirement; simply follow the directions and answer the question. You have 45 minutes to write.

QUESTION:

We have all been involved in work of one kind or another which has proved valuable for our growth as persons. The job may have been boring or satisfying, but it had some impact on our thinking about what we wanted out of life, or how we were going to plan our futures. Job experience can affect the decisions we make about our lives. For example, church sponsored activities may instill a desire to become a social worker, an assembly line job may produce in us a desire for a more fulfilling type of employment, or a job as a clerk may instill in us a desire to become a manager of a grocery store.

(1) Describe such a job in detail and (2) explain how it affected your attitudes toward yourself and your future.

CRITERIA: The student should be rewarded for what he or she does well.

6 A superior response will address itself to all aspects of the question, though much of the analysis may be implied. While the paper may have occasional faults, it will be well organized, detailed, and generally well written.

5-4 These scores will be appropriate for generally competent papers which may slight part of the question; may not be as clearly organized or as fully developed as the superior paper; may have some mechanical problems.

3-2 These scores will be appropriate for the following kinds of papers:

1. Those in which students provide few details and generalize about their job or jobs.

2. Those in which there is no explanation of effects of the job on the writer.

3. Those in which the writing exhibits serious weaknesses in structure, syntax, and diction.

1 This score is to be used for papers which show little understanding of the question or suggest incompetence in structure, syntax, and diction.

An extremely well-written response may be scored a point higher than it would be scored on the basis of content alone. A poorly written response may be scored a point lower.

Non-response papers or those which argue with or avoid the question should be given to the table leader.

Score apparent second language papers using the above guide. With such papers, mechanical problems should be judged by the degree to which language problems interfere with communication.

APPENDIX D

Analysis of Variance of Gains

VARIABLE	CODE	VALUE LABEL	SUM	MEAN	STD DEV	VARIANCE	N
For Entire Population			95.0000	0.3800	2.1518	4.6301	(250)
Method	1.	Garrison	122.000	0.968	2.158	4.655	(126)
Level	1.	Remedial	77.000	1.185	2.291	5.247	(65)
College	1.	City	20.000	1.250	2.176	4.733	(16)
College	2.	East	11.000	0.786	2.914	8.489	(14)
College	3.	Valley	13.000	1.083	1.975	3.902	(12)
College	4.	Trade	33.000	1.435	2.212	4.893	(23)
Level	2.	Freshman	45.000	0.738	1.999	3.997	(61)
College	1.	City	14.000	0.824	1.776	3.154	(17)
College	2.	East	25.000	1.471	2.625	6.890	(17)
College	3.	Valley	5.000	0.455	1.635	2.673	(11)
College	4.	Trade	1.000	0.063	1.526	2.329	(16)
Method	2.	non-Garrison	-27.000	-0.218	1.982	3.928	(124)
Level	1.	Remedial	4.000	0.062	1.722	2.965	(65)
College	1.	City	11.000	0.786	1.424	2.027	(14)
College	2.	East	-9.000	-0.529	1.586	2.515	(17)
College	3.	Valley	10.000	1.000	2.357	5.556	(10)
College	4.	Trade	-8.000	-0.333	1.435	2.058	(24)
Level	2.	Freshman	-31.000	-0.525	2.208	4.874	(59)
College	1.	City	-15.000	-0.938	2.144	4.596	(16)
College	2.	East	-4.000	-0.286	2.234	4.989	(14)
College	3.	Valley	-5.000	-0.357	2.341	5.478	(14)
College	4.	Trade	-7.000	-0.467	2.295	5.267	(15)

Total Cases = 250

Appendix D (Cont'd)

. Analysis of Variance of Gains

SOURCE OF VARIATION	SUM OF SQUARES	DF	MEAN SQUARE	F	SIGNIF OF F
Main Effects	108.64[illegible]	5	21.729	5.087	0.001
Method	88.362	1	88.362	20.686	0.001
College	4.102	3	1.367	0.320	0.999
Level	18.296	1	18.296	4.283	0.037
2-Way Interactions	31.888	7	4.555	1.066	0.386
Method College	8.155	3	2.718	0.636	0.999
Method Level	0.627	1	0.627	0.147	0.999
College Level	22.780	3	7.593	1.778	0.150
Explained	140.531	12	11.711	2.742	0.002
Residual	1012.347	237	4.272		
Total	1152.878	249	4.630		

250 cases were processed.
0 cases (0.0 PCT) were missing.

APPENDIX E

Summary of Student Questionnaire

Using the rating system, circle the number of the description which most accurately describes how effective this class has been in teaching you how to write.

		Number	Percentage	
1.	Not effective.	0	0	
2.	Slightly effective.	8	5.5	
3.	Moderately effective.	44	30.3	
4.	Quite effective.	72	49.6	94%
5.	Extremely effective.	21	14.4	64%

Using the rating system and taking into consideration that learning is a slow and difficult task, describe your achievement in writing goals:

		Number	Percentage	Mean
1.	Having enough specific, concrete information in my themes:			
1.	Never achieved.	1	.06	3.41
2.	Seldom achieved.	9	6.1	
3.	Occasionally achieved.	66	45.2	
4.	Often achieved.	56	38.3	
5.	Very often achieved.	14	9.5	47.8%
2.	Having a central idea or, in English I, a thesis.			
1.	Never achieved.	0	0	3.83
2.	Seldom achieved.	4	2.8	
3.	Occasionally achieved.	49	35.0	
4.	Often achieved.	53	37.8	
5.	Very often achieved.	34	24.2	62%
3.	Having an organizational plan which shapes the parts, a plan with a clear beginning, middle, and end.			
1.	Never achieved.	0	0	3.64
2.	Seldom achieved.	9	6.0	
3.	Occasionally achieved.	62	41.8	
4.	Often achieved.	50	33.7	
5.	Very often achieved.	27	18.2	51.9%
4.	Having sentences which are precise vehicles of thought and are grammatically sound (not fragments, run-ons or sentences with errors).			
1.	Never achieved.	0	0	3.49
2.	Seldom achieved.	25	16.7	
3.	Occasionally achieved.	47	31.5	
4.	Often achieved.	55	36.9	
5.	Very often achieved.	22	14.7	51.6%

Appendix E (Cont'd)

		Number	Percentage	Mean
5.	Having word choices which are effective and spelled correctly.			
1.	Never achieved.	3	2.0	3.65
2.	Seldom achieved.	10	6.8	
3.	Occasionally achieved.	45	30.8	
4.	Often achieved.	64	43.8 } 60.2%	
5.	Very often achieved.	24	16.4 }	
	Using the rating system, describe the most helpful aspects of this class.			
6.	The individual theme conferences.			
1.	Not helpful.	1	.07	3.95
2.	Slightly helpful.	8	5.6	
3.	Moderately helpful.	27	19.0	
4.	Quite helpful.	67	47.1 } 74.5%	
5.	Extremely helpful.	39	27.4 }	
7.	The smaller number of students enrolled in class.			
1.	Not helpful.	6	4.1	3.85
2.	Slightly helpful.	9	6.1	
3.	Moderately helpful.	33	22.6	
4.	Quite helpful.	51	34.9 } 67%	
5.	Extremely helpful.	47	32.1 }	
8.	Working on one thing at a time.			
1.	Not helpful.	1	.06	4.04
2.	Slightly helpful.	5	3.4	
3.	Moderately helpful.	27	18.6	
4.	Quite helpful.	66	45.5 } 77.2%	
5.	Extremely helpful.	46	31.7 }	
9.	Helpfulness of the teacher.			
1.	Not helpful.	0	0	4.32
2.	Slightly helpful.	7	4.6	
3.	Moderately helpful.	14	9.3	
4.	Quite helpful.	52	34.8 } 85.8%	
5.	Extremely helpful.	76	51.0 }	

Appendix E (Cont'd)

		Number	Percentage	Mean
10.	Helpfulness of student assistants.			
1.	Not helpful.	5	3.4	3.71
2.	Slightly helpful.	16	11.1	
3.	Moderately helpful.	35	24.3	
4.	Quite helpful.	41	28.4 } 61%	
5.	Extremely helpful.	47	32.6 }	
11.	Helpfulness of being able to rewrite and revise papers.			
1.	Not helpful.	0	0	4.34
2.	Slightly helpful.	2	1.3	
3.	Moderately helpful.	24	16.3	
4.	Quite helpful.	42	28.7 } 82.1%	
5.	Extremely helpful.	78	53.4 }	
12.	Helpfulness of learning how to check own papers.			
1.	Not helpful.	0	0	4.05
2.	Slightly helpful.	7	4.7	
3.	Moderately helpful.	33	22.6	
4.	Quite helpful.	51	34.9 } 72.5%	
5.	Extremely helpful.	55	37.6 }	
13.	Helpfulness of receiving personal explanations, rather than written comments.			
1.	Not helpful.	2	1.4	4.31
2.	Slightly helpful.	3	2.1	
3.	Moderately helpful.	13	9.2	
4.	Quite helpful.	53	37.8 } 87%	
5.	Extremely helpful.	69	49.2 }	

14. Since you have been in this class, do you have a better feeling about yourself as a writer than you did before?

Yes	113	78.4
No	6	4.1
Not sure	25	17.0

Questions 7 and 17 through 20 were fill-in questions which are summarized in the body of the paper.

15. Would you recommend more classes like this?

Yes	117	82.9
No	4	2.8
Not sure	20	14.1

APPENDIX F

Summary of Teacher Questionnaire

Using the rating system below, rate the effectiveness of the "Garrison" method in meeting these behavioral objectives in student writing:

		Number	Percentage	Mean
1.	Having enough specific, concrete information in themes.			
	1. Not effective.	0	0	5.00
	2. Slightly effective.	0	0	
	3. Moderately effective.	0	0	
	4. Quite effective.	0	0	
	5. Extremely effective.	7	100% of those respon.	
2.	Having a central idea, or in English I, a thesis.			
	1. Not effective.	0	0	5.00
	2. Slightly effective.	0	0	
	3. Moderately effective.	0	0	
	4. Quite effective.	0	0	
	5. Extremely effective.	7	100% of those respon.	
3.	Having an organizational plan.			
	1. Not effective.	0	0	4.85
	2. Slightly effective.	0	0	
	3. Moderately effective.	0	0	
	4. Quite effective.	1	14% } 100%	
	5. Extremely effective.	6	86% }	
4.	Having sentences which are precise vehicles of thought and are grammatically sound.			
	1. Not effective.	0	0	3.83
	2. Slightly effective.	0	0	
	3. Moderately effective.	2	33 % of those respon.	
	4. Quite effective.	3	50% } 67%	
	5. Extremely effective.	1	17% }	
5.	Having word choices which are effective and spelled correctly.			
	1. Not effective.	0	0	3.85
	2. Slightly effective.	1	14%	
	3. Moderately effective.	1	14%	
	4. Quite effective.	3	42% } 70%	
	5. Extremely effective.	2	28% }	

Appendix F (Cont'd)

	Number	Percentage		Mean
Using the same rating system, rank the items in terms of effectiveness.				
6. A fill-in question treated in the body of the report.				
7. Giving individualized instruction.				
1. Not effective.	0	0		5.00
2. Slightly effective.	0	0		
3. Moderately effective.	0	0		
4. Quite effective.	0	0		
5. Extremely effective.	8	100%		
8. Working on one thing at a time.				
1. Not effective.	0	0		4.50
2. Slightly effective.	0	0		
3. Moderately effective.	0	0		
4. Quite effective.	4	50%		
5. Extremely effective.	4	50%	100%	
9. Students knowing the grading standards.				
1. Not effective.	0	0		4.00
2. Slightly effective.	1	14%		
3. Moderately effective.	1	14%		
4. Quite effective.	2	28%		
5. Extremely effective.	3	42%	70%	
10. Smaller number of students enrolled.				
1. Not effective.	0	0		4.625
2. Slightly effective.	1	12 1/2%		
3. Moderately effective.	0	0		
4. Quite effective.	0	0		
5. Extremely effective.	7	87 1/2%	87 1/2%	
11. The tutors.				
1. Not effective.	0	0		4.25
2. Slightly effective.	0	0		
3. Moderately effective.	1	12 1/2%		
4. Quite effective.	4	50%		
5. Extremely effective.	3	37 1/2%	87 1/2%	
12. The opportunity for students to rewrite and revise.				
1. Not effective.	0	0		5.00
2. Slightly effective.	0	0		
3. Moderately effective.	0	0		
4. Quite effective.	0	0		
5. Extremely effective.	8	100%		

Appendix F (Cont'd)

		Number	Percentage	Mean
13.	Individual theme conferences.			
1.	Not effective.	0	0	4.875
2.	Slightly effective.	0	0	
3.	Moderately effective.	0	0	
4.	Quite effective.	1	12 1/2% } 100%	
5.	Extremely effective.	7	87 1/2% }	
14.	Students learning what to look for in proofreading their papers.			
1.	Not effective.	0	0	4.285
2.	Slightly effective.	0	0	
3.	Moderately effective.	1	14%	
4.	Quite effective.	3	43% } 86%	
5.	Extremely effective.	3	43% }	
15.	Giving personal explanations, rather than written comments.			
1.	Not effective.	0	0	4.75
2.	Slightly effective.	0	0	
3.	Moderately effective.	0	0	
4.	Quite effective.	2	25% } 100%	
5.	Extremely effective.	6	75% }	

Using the rating system below, rank these items of teacher satisfaction:

16.	Knowing a student's writing needs more specifically.			
1.	Not satisfying.	0	0	4.857
2.	Slightly satisfying.	0	0	
3.	Moderately satisfying.	0	0	
4.	Very satisfying.	1	14% } 100%	
5.	Extremely satisfying.	6	86% }	
17.	Seeing individual progress made by student.			
1.	Not satisfying.	0	0	4.5
2.	Slightly satisfying.	0	0	
3.	Moderately satisfying.	2	25%	
4.	Very satisfying.	0	0 } 75%	
5.	Extremely satisfying.	6	75% }	
18.	Being "free" from grading each piece of writing.			
1.	Not satisfying.	0	0	4.25
2.	Slightly satisfying.	0	0	
3.	Moderately satisfying.	1	12 1/2%	
4.	Very satisfying.	4	50% } 87 1/2%	
5.	Extremely satisfying.	3	37 1/2% }	

Appendix F (Cont'd)

		Number	Percentage	Mean
19.	Having fewer papers to take home.			
1.	Not satisfying.	0	0	4.14
2.	Slightly satisfying.	0	0	
3.	Moderately satisfying.	2	28 1/2%	
4.	Very satisfying.	2	28 1/2% → 71 1/2%	
5.	Extremely satisfying.	3	43%	
20.	Having more "assessment" and less "grading" to do.			
1.	Not satisfying.	0	0	4.42
2.	Slightly satisfying.	0	0	
3.	Moderately satisfying.	2	28 1/2%	
4.	Very satisfying.	0	0 → 71%	
5.	Extremely satisfying.	5	71%	
21.	Having a slightly different role in relationship to the student (more helper-assessor than grader-judge).			
1.	Not satisfying.	0	0	4.57
2.	Slightly satisfying.	0	0	
3.	Moderately satisfying.	1	14%	
4.	Very satisfying.	1	14% → 85%	
5.	Extremely satisfying.	5	71%	
22.	Having some input--a chance to intervene--while the theme is still in progress.			
1.	Not satisfying.	0	0	4.857
2.	Slightly satisfying.	0	0	
3.	Moderately satisfying.	0	0	
4.	Very satisfying.	1	14% → 100%	
5.	Extremely satisfying.	6	86%	
23.	Having the pressure on the students to produce, rather than on the teacher to "give" grades.			
1.	Not satisfying.	0	0	4.857
2.	Slightly satisfying.	0	0	
3.	Moderately satisfying.	0	0	
4.	Very satisfying.	1	14% → 100%	
5.	Extremely satisfying.	6	86%	

Appendix F (Cont'd)

		Number	Percentage	Mean
24.	Compare the satisfaction you have teaching the "Garrison" method to that you have teaching the conventional method. Do you find the Garrison method:			
	1. Less satisfying.	0	0	
	2. Equally satisfying.	0	0	
	3. More satisfying.	8	100%	
25.	Do you have a better feeling about teaching composition now than before you learned the "Garrison" method?			
	1. Yes.	8	100%	
	2. No.	0	0	
	3. Not sure.	0	0	
26.	Do you feel better about yourself as a composition teacher than before?			
	1. Yes.	6	75%	
	2. No.	1	12 1/2%	
	3. Not sure.	1	12 1/2%	
27.	Dr. White claims that the composition teacher's dilemma is encouraging the student to express himself while at the same time trying to restrict his expression to standard English. How well does the Garrison method reconcile this dilemma?			
	1. Not well.	0	0	
	2. Moderately well.	4	50%	
	3. Very well.	4	50%	
28.	Given tutors to help you, would you use this method next semester?			
	1. Yes.	8	100%	
	2. No.	0	0	
	3. Not sure.	0	0	

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE
FOR JUNIOR COLLEGES
NOV 15 1985